



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,125	08/09/2001	Larry Scheurich	6115-58351	5893
24197	7590	07/28/2005	EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP			TO, BAOQUOC N	
121 SW SALMON STREET			ART UNIT	
SUITE 1600			PAPER NUMBER	
PORTLAND, OR 97204			2162	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,125

Applicant(s)

SCHEURICH ET AL.

Examiner

Baoquoc N. To

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 36, 37, 39-69 and 71-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35, 38 and 70 ~~is/are withdrawn from consideration.~~ *examined.*
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22-34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42-58, 60, 63-69 and 72-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 072105, 051105
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2162

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicants elected Group I for examination with canceling of non-elected claims 35, 38 and 70, claim 74 is rewritten into dependent claim of claim 36 and claim 74 is newly added according to the restriction requirement dated on 03/24/2005.

Claims 1-34, 36-37 and 39-69 and 71-74 are pending in this application.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/21/2003 and 05/11/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2162

3. Claims 1-20, 22-34, 36-37, 39-40, 42-58, 60, 63-69 and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Agrawal et al. (US. Patent No. 6,278,977 B1).

Regarding on claim 1, Agrawal teaches a method of automating a decision-making process related to an organization based on a collection of data reflecting a state of the organization, the method comprising:

Selecting discrete coupleable items executable in a computer implemented workflow environment, wherein the discrete coupleable items encapsulate work associated with activities identified by decomposing the decision-making process (col. 6, lines 30-35); and

Creating an executable workflow by coupling a plurality of the discrete coupleable items, wherein at least one of the discrete coupleable items defines a query to be run against the collection of data, at least one of the discrete coupleable items defines an analysis to be performed based on results of the query, and at least one of the discrete coupleable items defines distribution of information based on the analysis to one or more destination (col. 6, lines 1-9).

Regarding on claim 2, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Scheduling the executable workflow for automatic execution (col. 13, lines 3-5).

Regarding on claim 3, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 2 wherein scheduling comprises:

Art Unit: 2162

Specifying a condition as a state change in data of the data collection serving as input to the decision-making process (col. 13, lines 3-14); and

Responsive to determining the condition has occurred, automatically executing the workflow (col. 13, lines 3-14).

Regarding on claim 4, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Scheduling the executable workflow for automatic initiation upon detection of a specified state change in the collection of data (col. 13, lines 3-14).

Regarding on claim 5, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow comprises at least one template having unbound values (col. 6, lines 45-50).

Regarding on claim 6, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow comprises at least one conditional branch (col. 13, lines 21-37).

Regarding on claim 7, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow comprises at least one gate (col. 13, lines 21-37).

Regarding on claim 8, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow is sharable among a plurality of users (col.12, lines 35-43).

Regarding on claim 9, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the collection of data comprises a data warehouse (col. 11, lines 38-40).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 10, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 9 wherein the data warehouse comprises databases having disparate schema (col. 6, lines 28-34).

Regarding on claim 11, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Executing the executable workflow (col. 11, lines 45-48).

Regarding on claim 12, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 11 further comprising: tracking workflow execution duration time (col. 13, lines 39-45).

Regarding on claim 13, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 11 further comprising:

During execution of the executable workflow, responsive to detecting a plurality of inputs to an item within the workflow, instantiating multiple instances of the item for accepting the inputs (col. 7, lines 56-62).

Regarding on claim 16, Agrawal teaches the method in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow is operable to identify a problem and provide a recommendation for avoiding the problem (col. 13, lines 5-10).

Regarding on claim 17, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Specifying a condition to trigger automatic initiation of execution of the executable workflow in the computer environment (col. 12, lines 56-62).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 18, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein at least one of the destinations represent a decision-maker (col. 12, lines 16-20).

Regarding on claim 19, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein at least one of the destination is associated with a wireless device.

Regarding on claim 20, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein at least one of the destination is an email address (col. 12, lines 16-20).

Regarding on claim 21, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein at least one of the destination is associated with web page (col. 9, lines 6-10).

Regarding on claim 2, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein at least one of the destination is associated with database (col. 6, lines 6-10)

Regarding on claim 23, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein at least one of the items defines a presentation event to a decision-maker (col. 12, lines 16-20).

Regarding on claim 24, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 23 further comprising: tracking a decision-maker's reaction to the presentation event (col. 12, lines 25-44).

Regarding on claim 25, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow comprises a meta sequence (col. 7, lines 45-47).

Regarding on claim 26, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Persisting the interim state of the workflow (col. 12, lines 35-44);

Providing access to the interim state of the workflow to a decision-maker (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 27, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 26 wherein providing access comprises providing a hyperlink to the interim state of the workflow (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 28, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow distributes a link to interim processing performed during execution of the workflow (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 29, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow performs closed-loop processing without further user input (col. 11, lines 60-65).

Regarding on claim 30, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow reflects best practices of the organization (col. 11, lines 24-31).

Regarding on claim 31, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow reflects best practices of the organization as determined by repeated execution and refinement of the workflow (col. 4, lines 40-45).



Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 32, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow distributes information based on the stored user permissions (col. 11, lines 1-7).

Regarding on claim 33, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 wherein the executable workflow selectively distributes exceptions when detected in the collection data (col. 11, lines 60-67).

Regarding on claim 34, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

Publishing the executable workflow to a plurality of users of the computer environment (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claims 36 and 37, Agrawal teaches the a computed-implemented method of generating and distributing information based on a collection of data, the method comprising:

Creating an executable sequence of associated discrete items executable in a computer environment, wherein at least one of the item defines a query to be run against the collection of data, at least one of the items define a distribution directive operable to distribute information based on the query to at least one destination, and at least tow the items are coupleable (col. 7, lines 45-50); and

Scheduling the executable sequence for automatic execution in the computer environment, wherein at least one of the coupleable item is denoted as coupled to another of the coupleable items (col. 13, lines 3-5).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 39, Agrawal teaches the computer-implemented method of defining query-based processing to be performed for a collection data, the method comprising:

Selecting a plurality of processing directives, wherein at least one of the processing directives is a query (col. 7, lines 37-44), and at least two of the processing directives are coupleable(col. 7, lines 45-50); and

Associating the processing directives into an executable sequence operable to generate and distribute information from the collection of data when executed, wherein at least a first of the processing directives is denoted as coupled to at least a second, other of the processing directives (col. 7, lines 45-50).

Regarding on claim 40, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 further comprising:

Scheduling the executable sequence for automatic periodic execution (col. 13, lines 3-5).

Regarding on claim 42, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 further comprising:

During execution of the executable sequence, as a result of processing the first processing directive, generating a result set (col. 11, lines 5-7); and

During execution of the executable sequence, coupling the second processing directive to the first processing directive by providing an identifier identifying the result set (col. 11, lines 7-10).

Regarding on claim 43, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directive is operable to accept input from another processing directive denoted as coupled thereto and distribute information to one or more destinations based on the input from the other processing directive (col. 11, lines 38-43).

Regarding on claim 44, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 43 further comprising: scheduling the processing directives for periodic execution to provide notifications of data exceptions in the data collection to at least one of the destination (col. 12, lines 34-44).

Regarding on claim 45, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 43 wherein the processing directive operable to distribute information is operable to distribute information to a web site, the method further comprising: scheduling the processing directives for periodic execution to update the web site (col. 13, lines 1-10).

Regarding on claim 46, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 43 further comprising:

Scheduling the processing directives for periodic execution to automatically order additional inventory responsive to detecting a shortage (col. 13, lines 1-10).

Regarding on claim 47, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 43 wherein the processing directive operable to distribute information is configurable to distribute information to a variety of destination types (col. 13, lines 1-10).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 48, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 47 wherein the destination types comprise the following destination types:

Wireless device destination type(col. 13, lines 1-10); and

An email destination type (col. 13, lines 1-10).

Regarding on claim 49, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 43 wherein at least one of the destinations is associated with a user (col. 12, lines 35-43); and

Distributing of at least some of the information directed to the processing directive operable to distribute information is blocked based on stored permissions of the user (col. 12, lines 35-43).

Regarding on claim 50, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 49 wherein at least one of the destination is associated with another user; and

Access to the blocked information is permitted for the other user based on stored permissions of the other user (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 51, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 43 wherein the sequence produces interim results, the method further comprising:

Storing the interim results (col. 12, lines 1-7); and

Distributing to at least one of the destinations a link by which the interim results can be accessed (col. 12, lines 1-7).

Regarding on claim 52, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 51 further comprising: blocking access to at least a portion of the interim results by a user based on stored permissions for the user (col. 12, lines 1-7).

Regarding on claim 53, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 39 further comprising: responsive to the associating, when executing the sequence, coupling output of the first processing directive to input of the second processing directives (col. 12, lines 1-7).

Regarding on claim 54, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directives is operable to select one out of at least two possible next processing directives denoted as coupled thereto during execution to selectively direct execution flow (col. 7, lines 45-50).

Regarding on claim 55, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directives is operable to filter out information not meeting specified criteria (col. 11, lines 56-67).

Regarding on claim 56, teaches the method recited in claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directives is operable to filter out information not appearing in a top n records according to a specified sorting criteria.

Regarding on claim 57, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 wherein: the sequence comprises at least a query processing directive, an analysis processing directive, and a distribution processing directive (col. 12, lines 35-40).

Regarding on claim 58, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 57, wherein at least one query processing directive and at least one analysis processing directive generate result in a same format, and the analysis processing directive and at least one distribution processing directive accept result in the same format (col. 11, lines 1-7).

Regarding on claim 60, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 further comprising: when executing the sequence, storing a result set accessible to and of a format processable by the second processing directive to couple the output of the first processing directive to the input of the second processing directive (col. 11, lines 24-31).

Regarding on claim 63, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 60, wherein the resulted set is accessible to the second processing directive via an identifier identifying the result set (col. 11, lines 37-43).

Regarding on claim 64, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directives is sharable among a plurality of users (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 65, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 39 wherein at least one of the processing directives is included in another executable sequence (col. 7, lines 45-50).

Regarding on claim 66, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 64 further comprising: accepting user edits to the processing directive to modify execution of more than one sequence (col. 11, lines 55-60).

Regarding on claim 67, Agrawal teaches the method of claim 39 further comprising: publishing the execution sequence to a plurality of users (to all users) (col. 12, lines 35-44).

Regarding on claim 68, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 67 further comprising: accepting user edits to the published executable sequence (col. 13, lines 5-10); and

Saving the edited published executable sequence as a separate executable sequence (col. 13, lines 5-10).

Regarding on claim 69, Agrawal teaches a computer-implemented method of defining query-based processing to be performed for a collection of data, the method comprising:

Selecting a set of plurality of chainable discrete database operation items, wherein the set of chainable discrete database operations items is operable to generate information from the collection of data and at least one of the chainable discrete database operations items is a query (col. 11, lines 38-63); and associating chainable discrete database operations items into an executable sequence (col. 11, lines 50-54).

Regarding on claims 72 and 73, Agrawal teaches software-based system for defining query-based processing to be performed on a collection of data, the system comprising:

A sequence builder operable to accept a selection of a plurality of processing directives for generating information from the collection of data, wherein at least one of the processing directives is a query (col. 11, lines 38-43) and at least one of the processing directives is a template (col. 6, lines 30-35);

A parameter acceptor for accepting parameters to be bound to the template (col. 6, lines 29-31); and

Bindery for associating the processing directives and the parameters into an executable sequence (col. 6, lines 30-35).

Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claims 14-15 and 74, Agrawal teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the decision-making process comprises a financial-based decision-making process for the organization; wherein the executable workflow is operable to identify budget overrun for cost centers (col. 13, lines 21-38); wherein the collection of data comprises a data warehouse (col. 9, lines 38-44); wherein the at least one discrete coupleable item defining defining a query is operable to generating to the cost centers (col. 13, lines 21-38); wherein the at least one discrete coupleable item defining distribution is operable to distribute information indicating the identified budget overrun to a manager responsible for the cost center (col. 13, lines 21-38); and wherein the method further comprising: scheduling the executable workflow for periodic execution (col. 13, lines 45-50); and executing the executable workflow to generate automatic notifications to the manager responsive to detecting a budget overrun (col. 13, lines 21-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 21, 41, 59, 61-62 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal (US. Patent No. 6,278,977 B1) in view of Vishnubhotla (US. Patent No. 6,718,338 B2).



Art Unit: 2162

Regarding on claim 71, Agrawal teaches the computer-implemented system for defining –query-based processing to be performed for a collection of data via specification of a sequence of loosely-coupled processing directives, the system comprising:

A sequence definer for accepting a set of loosely-coupled processing directives, wherein at least on of the processing directives is a query (col. 12, lines 35-40);

A sequence execution coordinator for coordinating execution of the sequence and coupling the processing directives during execution of the sequence (col. 9, lines 7-20).

Agrawal does not explicitly teach stored the query results in XML format, wherein at least one of the processing directives is a distribution directive and accepts its input in XML format. However, Vishnubhotla stored the query results in XML format, wherein at least one of the processing directives is a distribution directive and accepts its input in XML format (col. 1, lines 28-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Agrawal's system to include accepting the user inputs and storing the result in the XML format as taught by Vishnubhotla in order to provide data mining in the web enable service.

Regarding on claims 21, 41 and 61, Agrawal does not teaches the method of claim 60 wherein the result set is a markup language format. However, Vishnubhotla teaches the result set is a markup language format (col. 1, lines 28-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2162

time of the invention was made to modify Agrawal's system to include retrieving the result in the XML format as taught by Vishnubhotla in order to provide data mining in the web enable service.

Regarding on claims 59 and 62, Agrawal does not explicitly teach the method recited in claim 60 wherein the result set is of XML format. Vishnubhotla teaches the result set is of XML format (col. 1, lines 28-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Agrawal's system to include retrieving the result in the XML format as taught by Vishnubhotla in order to provide data mining in the web enable service.

#### ***Contact Information***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231.


The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Art Unit: 2162

Baoquoc N. To

July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2005



**MOHAMMAD ALI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**